

Department of Defense (DoD)
Civilian Personnel Management Service (CPMS)
Field Advisory Services - *FAS*
Classification Appeal Decision

DoD Decision:	WS-4701-08 (title at agency's discretion)
Initial classification:	Maintenance Supervisor 1, WS-4701-08
Organization:	U. S. Marine Corps Base Facilities Department Base Facilities Division Maintenance and Repair Branch Emergency Services Section
Date:	May 7, 1998

BACKGROUND

Civilian Personnel Management Service received this job grading appeal on March 9, 1998. The appellant's job is classified as Maintenance Supervisor I, WS-4701-08, and is located in Base Maintenance at a Marine Corps Base. The appellant is requesting that his job be reclassified as Maintenance Supervisor I, WS-4701-09. No reasons are provided in the appeal documentation submitted by the appellant as to why he believes that the classification of his job is in error, however, he does state that his job is not equal in grade to similar positions in the same organization. The appellant certifies that his official job description accurately describes his major duties and responsibilities.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

This appeal decision is based on information from the following sources:

1. The appellant's letter of August 11, 1997.
2. Telephone interviews with the appellant on April 10th and 20th, 1998.

INFORMATION ON THE JOB

The appellant directs the operations of a workforce of approximately 18 employees involved in journey level structural trade occupations performing maintenance and repair work on housing and other structures throughout the base.

STANDARDS REFERENCED

1. Federal Wage System Job Grading System, Part I, Explanation of the FWS Job Grading System
2. FWS Job Grading for Supervisors, TS-66, December 1992

PAY SYSTEM DETERMINATION

A job is exempt from the General Schedule only if the paramount requirement of the job is knowledge and experience in trades, crafts, or laboring. The primary duty for the appellant's job is direction of workers in trades tasks. The chief requirement of his job is knowledge and experience in trades and labor related to structural maintenance and repair operations. Consequently, his job is exempt from the General Schedule and falls under the Federal Wage System (FWS).

TITLE AND CODE DETERMINATION

The appellant does not contest the title or occupational code assigned to his job. The Job Grading Standard (JGS) for Supervisors states that the occupational code and title for supervisory jobs is normally derived from the work which best reflects the overall nature of the work operations supervised. When the work of more than one occupation is supervised, the occupational code of a supervisory job is the same as the code that best reflects the overall nature of the work of the occupations supervised and/or that is the most important for recruitment, selection, placement, and other personnel uses. Usually this is the occupational code appropriate for the highest level of non-supervisory work supervised. However, if no single occupation predominates, the 01 code of the most appropriate job family is used.

The appellant supervises Maintenance Mechanics, WG-4749-09, and a Maintenance Worker, WG-4749-08, Carpenters, WG-4607-09, and Carpentry Workers, WG-4607-07, and Painters, WG-4102-09. None of these occupations predominates in the operations of the Unit. The activity determined that the general series for the General Maintenance and Operations Work Family, WG-4700, best represented the overall nature of the work. This family includes occupations which consist of various combinations of work such as are involved in constructing, maintaining, and repairing buildings and related facilities. This reflects the basic mission and work of the appellant's organization better than any other family and better conveys the work directed than any other group. Therefore, we agree with the activity determination that the WG-4700 group, and the 01 code within this group, are most appropriate for the appellant's job.

Jobs covered by the JGS for Supervisors are identified by the job title of the occupation selected followed by the title Supervisor. There are no prescribed titles for the WG-4701 occupation. Accordingly, the title for the appellant's job is at the discretion of the activity, consistent with the titling instructions in Section III, Part I, B of the Federal Wage System for Trades and Labor Occupations.

GRADE DETERMINATION

The JGS for Supervisors uses three factors for evaluation purposes: Nature of Supervisory Responsibility, Level of Work Supervised, and Scope of Work Operations Supervised. The JGS for Supervisors is a "threshold" standard, meaning that a level must be fully met in order to be credited. The appellant's position is evaluated as follows:

Factor I, Nature of Supervisory Responsibility

This factor considers the nature of the supervisory duties performed, and the type and degree of responsibility for control over the work supervised. The factor describes four basic supervisory situations depicting successively higher levels of supervisory responsibility and authority for scheduling work operations, planning use of resources to accomplish scheduled or unscheduled work, directing subordinates in performing work assignments, and carrying out administrative duties.

The activity credited the job with Situation #1, and we agree that the appellant's duties meet that level, where work operations are carried out by workers in accomplishing trades or labor work operations in a segment of an organization, a group, or work shift. The appellant believes his job meets the criteria of Situation #2.

Supervisors in Situation #2 are responsible for supervising workers directly or through subordinate leaders and/or supervisors in accomplishing the work of an organizational segment or group. Supervisors in Situation #2 perform the following:

Planning:

- Plan use of subordinate workers, equipment, facilities, and materials on a week-to-week or month-to-month basis;
- Establish deadlines, priorities, and work sequences, and plan work assignments based on general work schedules, methods, and policies set by higher level supervisors;
- Coordinate work with supporting or related work functions controlled by other supervisors;
- Determine the number and types of workers needed to accomplish specific projects;
- Redirect individual workers and resources to accomplish unanticipated work

- (e.g., work resulting from "open and inspect" types of work orders);
- Inform higher level supervisors of the need to revise work schedules and re-establish labor and other resources; and
- Participate with their superiors in the initial planning of current and future work schedules, budget requests, staffing needs, estimates, and recommendations as to scheduling projected work.

All of the above Planning criteria are not met. The appellant does not have a significant requirement to coordinate work with supporting or related functions controlled by other supervisors as intended by the standard. Most of his Unit's projects are accomplished in-house and only when projects are too large or require trade specialties not resident in his unit is he required to deal with another supervisor. In the first case, he requests additional structural workers through his second level supervisor, and in the second he advises shops with related trade skills of reported or observed damage or malfunctions. This does not meet the intent of the standard which is that this would be coordination with supervisors of other organizations who would be completing different parts or phases of a larger project or projects.

Further, the appellant does not participate with superiors in any significant way with respect to planning work schedules, and does not deal with budget or provide recommendations to them as to scheduling projected work. The work schedule and budget for the main bulk of the work (renovations) are developed, monitored and executed by the customer (Family Housing Manager) and his staff. The appellant provides cost and project updates to the housing manager who monitors for budget and coordinates project work schedules between the appellant's unit and contractor personnel.

Work Direction

- Investigate work related problems such as excessive costs or low productivity and determine causes;
- Implement corrective actions within their authority to resolve work problems; and
- Recommend solutions to staffing problems, engineering requirements, and work operations directed by other supervisors.

All of the above Work Direction criteria are not met. The appellant has no responsibility for recommending solutions to problems, requirements or work operations directed by other supervisors. His responsibilities are limited to the unit he supervises. Nor does he have any responsibilities related to investigation of problems related to productivity or cost to determine causes.

Administration

- Plan and establish overall leave schedule;
- Determine training needs of subordinates and arrange for its accomplishment, set

- performance standards, and make formal appraisals of subordinate work performance; and
- Initiate recommendations for promotion or reassignment of subordinates

Situation #2 is not met because the appellant does not meet one or more of the Planning and Work Direction criteria.

The appellant's position is credited with Situation #1.

Factor II, Level of Work Supervised

This factor considers the level and complexity of the work operations supervised, and their effect on the difficulty and responsibility of the supervisor's job. The activity determined that WG-09 best represented the level and complexity of the work in the organization supervised by the appellant. The appellant does not contest this determination, with which we concur.

Factor III, Scope of Work Operations Supervised

This factor considers the scope of the jobs supervisory responsibility in terms of: (1) the scope of the assigned work function and organizational authority; (2) the variety of functions the job is required to supervise; and (3) the physical dispersion, work coordination, and location of subordinate employees. This factor is divided into three subfactors, which are in turn subdivided into levels with points assigned to each level. An appropriate level is selected for each subfactor and the corresponding point values are totaled. The total points are then converted to specific levels under Factor III using the conversion chart located at the end of this factor.

Subfactor A - Scope of Assigned Work Function and Organizational Authority

This subfactor measures the scope of the assigned work function or mission, i.e., the purpose of the job in the organization, the extent and nature of the job's authority in relation to the organizational assignment, and the importance of the job's decisions.

At Level A-2, supervisors have first or second level supervisory and decision authority over an organizational segment which typically has been established on the basis of being a distinct work function or mission. Supervisors make routine decisions regarding execution of policy which has been interpreted or established by the next higher level. Decisions typically involve the work or assignments and how they are completed.

At Level A-3, supervisors have second level or higher supervisory and decision authority for work functions or a portion of a mission requirement (e.g., a specific program in a designated geographic location or a specific function). The scope of the mission or work functions at this level typically requires supervisors to utilize several

subordinate supervisors and leaders through structured working relationships among subordinate groups of employees, formal procedures for scheduling and assigning work and work results, and the issuance of instructions through subordinate supervisors and leaders.

The activity credited Level A-2. The appellant does not contest this determination, with which we concur. The appellant has first level supervisory and decision authority over a distinct mission. Level A-3 is not met as the appellant does not have second level or higher supervisory and decision authority.

This subfactor is credited at Level A-2, 45 points.

Subfactor B, Variety of Function.

This subfactor evaluates the difficulties of technical supervision of work functions which may vary from being essentially similar to markedly dissimilar. Similar or related work functions have a common or related body of knowledges, skills, work procedures, and tools. Supervision of dissimilar or unrelated functions require broader technical knowledges and planning and coordination skills than those required for supervision of similar work functions.

At Level B-3, the supervisor directs the work of subordinates in one or more similar or related occupations at grades 8-13.

Level B-4 is similar to Level B-3 except that supervisors at this level direct the work of subordinates in dissimilar or unrelated occupations at grades 8-13.

As at Level B-4, the appellant directs subordinates in dissimilar occupations, e.g., Carpentry, Maintenance Mechanic, and Painting, at a grade between WG-8 and 13. His Unit lacks the higher graded work required for greater credit.

This subfactor is evaluated at Level B-4, 60 points.

Subfactor C - Workforce Dispersion

This subfactor evaluates the varying levels of difficulty associated with monitoring and coordinating the work of non-supervisory and supervisory personnel who vary from being collocated to widely dispersed. Dispersion of workforce considers the duration of projects, number of work sites, frequency of dispersion, and the necessity to monitor and coordinate the work.

The activity credited the appellant's job at Level C-1, where subordinate employees are located in several buildings or work sites within a defined location such as a military base, National Park, or large Federal complex consisting of many multifloor buildings

and support facilities. At this level work assignments vary in terms of duration; however, most assignments at this level are of a limited duration (e.g., assignments are typically accomplished within a few days or weeks). In addition, this level also includes off-base (i.e., within the local commuting area) facility support and maintenance assignments. The appellant's job closely parallels this level and we concur with the assignment of C-1.

At level C-2, subordinate employees are located in work groups of varying sizes at numerous job sites within large military bases (e.g., air rework facilities, supply depots, shipyards, and comparable Federal facilities). Employees or work groups at this level may on occasion work outside of the commuting area or across State lines. Work assignments at this level are typically on an ongoing basis and are accomplished within several weeks or months. For example, this would include employees who regularly repair, overhaul, and maintain ships in dry dock or aircraft at depots. This level is not met. The appellant's subordinates work mainly on housing quarters which are located at two sites. Most of his subordinates are located at a single site, which is the largest of the work sites, is about 5 square miles in size, and includes approximately 1,800 housing units. The second work site, includes about 700 housing units and is about 3 miles distant. Work is also performed at a trailer park which includes 200-300 trailer parking spots and is no more than 5 miles away. Work performed there includes maintaining fencing, garages and storage sheds. One subordinate is assigned to perform maintenance and repair work at a nearby installation which includes a theater, bachelor officer's quarters, mess hall, classroom, and office spaces. Renovation projects last an average of two weeks and no work projects are outside the commuting area.

This subfactor is credited at Level C-1, 5 points.

Factor III is evaluated as follows:

Factor III Summary		
Subfactor	Level	Points
A. Scope of Assigned Work Function and Organizational Authority	A-2	45
B. Variety of Function	B-4	60
C. Workforce Dispersion	C-1	5
Total		110

A total of 100 points for this factor converts to Level B (70-110 points) according to the Point Conversion Chart on page 20 of the standard.

Summary	
Factor	
Factor I. Nature of Supervisory Responsibility	Situation #1
Factor II. Level of Work Supervised	WG-09
Factor III. Scope of Work Operations Supervised	Level B

Tentative Grade Assignment:

By application of the Grading Table on page 24 of the standard for positions evaluated as Situation #1 under Factor I, the intersection in the table where the Level of Work Supervised (Factor II) is grade 09 and the Scope of Work Operations Supervised (Factor III) is Level B equates to a tentative grade of WS-08.

Grade level Adjustment:

Both upward and downward grade adjustments from the tentative grade are required based on certain circumstances. A situation requiring a downward adjustment is offset by an upward adjustment. Grade level adjustments may not exceed one grade level.

Downward: A downward adjustment is indicated when the tentative grade of the appellant's job would be the same as his superior. The appellant's supervisor is graded at the WS-10 level, therefore, this provision is not pertinent.

Upward: Upward grade adjustments are indicated for borderline jobs and work situations that impose special or unusual demands.

Borderline Jobs: An upward adjustment is indicated when the supervisory job substantially exceed the situation credited under Factor I and the base level of work determined under Factor II is not the highest level of subordinate work for which the supervisor has full technical responsibility. The appellant's work situation meets, but does not exceed, Situation #1, for which he received full credit, and the base level of WG-09, for which he was credited, is the highest level of work in the organization. Therefore, no upward adjustment is warranted.

Special or Unusual Demands: In some situations, special staffing requirements may impose a substantially greater than normal responsibility for job design, job engineering, work scheduling, training, counseling, motivating, and maintaining security. This may occur under special employment programs and at correctional

institutions having exceptionally difficult attitudinal, motivational, control, and security problems. An upward grade adjustment is indicated when exceptional conditions affect the majority of the subordinate workforce. None of these demands are present in the subject job.

None of the adjustment situations described above are applicable to the appellant's job, therefore, no adjustment to the tentative grade is warranted.

DECISION:

This job is properly classified as WS-4701-08, with the title according to activity discretion.